

REMARKS

BY

WILLIAM H. WEBSTER

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

BROOKINGS INSTITUTE

10 NOVEMBER 1987

IT'S A GREAT PLEASURE FOR ME TO BE HERE. I STARTED TO MAKE A LIST OF THE PEOPLE THAT I SAW HERE THIS EVENING WHO HAVE HAD A PROFOUND IMPACT ON ME, ON THIS TOWN, AND ON THE COUNTRY'S WELFARE. I QUICKLY REALIZED THAT THE LIST -- STARTING WITH MY OLD COLLEAGUE BOBBY INMAN -- WAS MUCH TOO LONG. I'D JUST LIKE TO SAY I'M GLAD TO SEE SO MANY OF YOU HERE TONIGHT.

ONE OF THE FIRST THINGS THAT HAPPENED TO ME WHEN I CAME HERE WAS THAT I WAS INVITED TO MEET WITH THE FELLOWS FROM TIME TO TIME AND TO SHARE IDEAS. THEY HAVE BEEN NICE ENOUGH TO INVITE ME BACK THROUGH THE YEARS, AND I HAVE GENUINELY ENJOYED IT.

I WOULD LIKE TO SAY BEFORE I START THAT THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH THE WORD "COVER." I HOPE TO DEMONSTRATE TONIGHT THAT THE PROBLEM IS A COMBINATION OF THE WORD "COVER" WITH THE WORD "UP."

NOT TOO LONG AGO SOMEONE GAVE ME A LAPEL BUTTON. I SHOULD HAVE BROUGHT IT WITH ME TONIGHT. IT SAYS: "MY JOB IS SO SECRET THAT EVEN I DON'T KNOW WHAT I'M DOING." AND I THINK MAYBE THERE'S A LITTLE BIT OF A MESSAGE THERE FOR ME

AND FOR ALL OF US ABOUT HOW MANY PEOPLE FEEL ABOUT SECRECY IN THIS COUNTRY.

I'M SURE THAT TO MANY PEOPLE IT CONJURES UP ORWELLIAN IMAGES OF INTRUSION INTO

OUR PRIVACY, OF CLANDESTINE ACTIVITIES CALCULATED TO PUT AT RISK OUR MOST,

CHERISHED LIBERTIES, OF MISTAKES AND BLUNDERS CONCEALED WITHIN DOCUMENTS

CLASSIFIED "SECRET" OR "EYES ONLY." A LITTLE OF THAT IS POSSIBLY TRUE IN

VARYING DEGREES, AND CERTAINLY ANCIENT AND RECENT HISTORY WOULD REINFORCE

THOSE CONCERNS. BUT I THINK MOST OF THE PEOPLE HERE WHO HAVE SERVED IN

GOVERNMENT -- CERTAINLY BOB INMAN, BOB MCNAMARA, GERARD SMITH, AND OTHERS --

MUST KNOW THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING ABLE TO REACH CONCLUSIONS AND TAKE ACTION

WITHOUT FIRST READING ABOUT IT IN THE NEWSPAPER. NOT ONLY LIVES AND PROGRAMS,

BUT THE VERY PROCESS ITSELF MAY DEPEND UPON THE ABILITY TO RETAIN A LEVEL OF

SECRECY IN AN APPROPRIATE MANAGED WAY. THAT IS WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO

YOU ABOUT TONIGHT.

TAKING A LEAF OR TWO FROM MY EXPERIENCES ON THE FEDERAL BENCH AND AS

DIRECTOR OF THE FBI, I HAVE TAKEN UP MY NEW RESPONSIBILITIES WITH TWO CARDINAL

THESES: FIRST, THAT THE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES VITAL TO THE PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY MUST BE CONDUCTED OBJECTIVELY, PROFESSIONALLY, AND WITH ABSOLUTE FIDELITY TO OUR CONSTITUTION AND OUR LAWS. SECOND, THAT THERE MUST BE A TRUSTWORTHY SYSTEM OF OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY WHICH BUILDS RATHER THAN ERODES, TRUST BETWEEN THOSE WHO HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGING OUR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM AND THOSE WHO ACT AS SURROGATES FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. HOW WELL I AM ABLE TO PRESERVE THOSE CONCEPTS WILL DETERMINE THE KIND OF JOB THAT I AM ABLE TO DO WHILE I'M HERE.

INTELLIGENCE HAS ALWAYS PLAYED A MAJOR ROLE IN OUR HISTORY. A FEW YEARS AGO, MALCOLM FORBES GAVE BILL CASEY AND ME COPIES OF A LETTER WRITTEN BY GEORGE WASHINGTON IN 1779 TO A MAJOR TALLMADGE EXPLAINING THE IMPORTANCE OF INTELLIGENCE AND THE NECESSITY OF SECRECY. THE LETTER EVEN GAVE A LITTLE ADVICE ON HOW TO USE DIFFERENT WRITING. I HAVE SEEN OTHER WRITINGS OF SIMILAR IMPORT AND WAS INTERESTED TO READ THAT IN 1789 SECRET FUNDING FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES WAS FORMALIZED IN CONGRESS IN THE FORM OF A SECRET CONTINGENCY FUND USED BY THE PRESIDENT.

TODAY, OUR GOVERNMENT DEPENDS HEAVILY UPON ACCURATE INTELLIGENCE:
INTELLIGENCE TO FORMULATE OUR FOREIGN POLICY; INTELLIGENCE TO VERIFY THE ARMS
AGREEMENTS THAT WE HAVE SIGNED AND TO DETERMINE WHETHER FUTURE ARMS AGREEMENTS
CAN BE SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED TO WARRANT THEIR ADOPTION INTO TREATIES; AND
PERHAPS OF MOST IMPORTANCE, INTELLIGENCE TO UNDERSTAND THE MILITARY
CAPABILITIES AND THE INTENTIONS OF OUR ADVERSARIES. OUR PRIMARY CONSUMERS ARE
THE PRESIDENT, THE VICE PRESIDENT, THE SECRETARIES OF STATE, DEFENSE, AND
TREASURY, THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND OF COURSE THE SELECT COMMITTEES OF
THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE.

IT'S CLEAR THAT INTELLIGENCE, IN ORDER TO BE USEFUL, MUST BE TIMELY. IF I
HAD ANY DOUBTS ABOUT IT, THEY WERE ERASED WHEN I FOLLOWED A LITTLE ADVICE FROM
BOB INMAN AT THE BEGINNING OF MY TERM AND VISITED NORAD IN COLORADO SPRINGS IN
JULY, AND JUST A WEEK OR SO WHEN I VISITED SAC HEADQUARTERS IN OMAHA. TODAY
IN TRYING TO DEAL WITH THREATS, THE NAKED THREATS, THE ULTIMATE THREATS TO OUR
NATIONAL SECURITY, INTELLIGENCE MUST BE MEASURED NOT IN TERMS OF WEEKS OR

MONTHS, BUT IN TERMS OF MINUTES. AND HOW WE DEVELOP THAT INTELLIGENCE, HOW WE ARE ABLE TO GET OUT IN FRONT OF OUR PROBLEMS SO THAT WE CAN ANTICIPATE AND MAKE WISE JUDGMENTS THAT AFFECT THE LIVES AND SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY, IS THE ULTIMATE QUESTION AND THE ULTIMATE CHALLENGE FOR MODERN INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION.

INTELLIGENCE MUST ALSO BE OBJECTIVE. WE'VE HEARD TOO MANY TIMES SUGGESTIONS THAT INTELLIGENCE, MODERN AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE, IS "COOKED" -- THAT IT IS PLANTED TO SHAPE A PRECONCEIVED OBJECTIVE EITHER OF THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE OR THE ADMINISTRATION THAT HE SERVES AND THAT IT MAY NOT BE TRUSTED. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT AS WE DEVELOP INTELLIGENCE THAT THAT SUSPICION BE REMOVED, INsofar AS IT CAN BE REMOVED, AND SO WE HAVE BEEN PUTTING INTO PLACE PROCEDURES TO BUILD CONFIDENCE IN THE PROCESS. ONE STEP THAT I TOOK WAS TO ASK NOT TO SERVE ON THE CABINET, TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT I WAS NOT A POLICYMAKER. ANOTHER STEP I TOOK WAS TO ENSURE THAT INTELLIGENCE WOULD BE PRODUCED, PROFESSIONALLY AND OBJECTIVELY WITHIN THE INTELLIGENCE

COMMUNITY OR WHERE WE HAVE THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS, THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE COUNCIL AND A GREAT MANY EXPERTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PRODUCTION OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATES. I DO NOT ATTEMPT TO SHAPE THOSE PROJECTS. I EXAMINE THE TERMS OF REFERENCE ALONG WITH OTHERS TO BE CERTAIN THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE USEFUL TO OUR CONSUMERS AND NOT SIMPLY ANOTHER RESEARCH PROJECT. BUT I DO NOT ATTEMPT TO SHAPE THE OUTCOME OR LIMIT THE EXAMINATION BEYOND THAT POINT. AND I DO NOT ANY LONGER FOLLOW THE PRACTICE OF READING AND COMMENTING AND SUGGESTING CHANGES FOR THE DRAFTS AS THEY MOVE FORWARD. I READ THEM ALONG WITH THE OTHER INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS, THE PROGRAM MANAGERS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY, THE DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY, THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, INTELLIGENCE SERVICES THROUGHOUT THE AREA -- ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE -- THE OTHER MEMBERS OF OUR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY. AND THEY HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE THE SAME COMMENTS THAT I DO. WE ARE VERY CAREFUL TO BE SURE THAT DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW ARE REFLECTED IN PLACES WITHIN THE ESTIMATE WHERE THEY WILL BE SEEN AND

NOT OVERLOOKED. AND THEN, IN TURN, WE HAVE MADE IT CLEAR TO THE POLICYMAKERS. SOME OF THE POLICYMAKERS DO NOT ALWAYS LIKE WHAT THEY RECEIVE FROM US, AND SOME HAVE ALREADY ACTED BEFORE THEY HAVE ASKED FOR OR SEEN OUR ESTIMATES. THEY ARE FREE TO USE THE ESTIMATES IN ANY WAY THAT THEY CHOOSE -- INCLUDING A QUICK TRIP TO THE WASTEBASKET IF THAT'S THEIR CONCLUSION. THE ONE THING THEY MAY NOT DO IS CHANGE THEM. THESE ESTIMATES ARE ARRIVED AT AS PROFESSIONALLY AND OBJECTIVELY AS POSSIBLE, AND WE ARE GOING TO ADHERE TO THAT.

ANOTHER AREA IN WHICH THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY PLAYS A ROLE IS IMPLEMENTING FOREIGN POLICY THROUGH THE USE OF COVERT ACTION. I WOULD LIKE TO EMPHASIZE TONIGHT THAT THE CIA DOES NOT HAVE A FOREIGN POLICY OF ITS OWN. OUR JOB IS TO IMPLEMENT OUR NATIONAL FOREIGN POLICY. THAT POLICY IS REVIEWED AND SCRUTINIZED IN CONGRESS, AND IT IS VERY CLEAR WHAT THAT POLICY IS. BUT THERE MAY BE OCCASIONS WHEN IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THAT POLICY IN A WAY THAT DOES NOT IDENTIFY THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES. IN MY LIFETIME FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT FORWARD, EVERY PRESIDENT HAS ENDORSED AND USED COVERT

ACTION. I HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO DISCOVER WHETHER HERBERT HOOVER HAD AN INTEREST IN THE SUBJECT, BUT VIRTUALLY EVERY OTHER PRESIDENT HAS FOUND IT NECESSARY TO DRAW ON THIS CAPABILITY. COVERT ACTIONS ARE, OF COURSE, THE FOCUS OF THE GREATEST CONGRESSIONAL ATTENTION. BUT STRANGELY ENOUGH, COVERT ACTION ACCOUNTS FOR ONLY ABOUT 3 PERCENT OF THE RESOURCES SPENT ON INTELLIGENCE.

BOTH THE CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY HAVE RECOGNIZED THE NEED FOR SECRECY IN MATTERS OF NATIONAL SECURITY. THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT, WITH WHICH I'VE HAD A LONG HISTORY BECAUSE OF MY WORK IN THE FBI, CONTAINS EXPRESS PROVISIONS EXEMPTING FROM DISCLOSURE INFORMATION OBTAINED IN EITHER FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OR SUPPLIED BY FOREIGN AGENCIES IN COOPERATION WITH US. THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT, WHICH IS THE AUTHORITY BY WHICH ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE IS CONDUCTED IN AID OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE IN THIS COUNTRY AND THE ONLY MEANS BY WHICH FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE CAN BE SUBJECT TO ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE, PROVIDES FOR A SECRET COURT, MEETING IN A SECRET

PLACE WITH SECURE METHODS FOR PROTECTING SECRET RECORDS. THOSE SECRECY PROVISIONS CLEARLY REFLECT AN UNDERSTANDING AND A NEED FOR SECRECY IN THESE MATTERS. THE REAL PURPOSE OF SECRECY IS TO PRESERVE AND PROTECT SOURCES AND METHODS -- TWO WORDS THAT WERE NOT FAMILIAR TO ME AS A LAWYER AND A JUDGE BUT WHICH I HAVE COME TO UNDERSTAND ARE AT THE VERY TOP OF RESPONSIBLE INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION. IF WE CANNOT PROTECT SOURCES, WHETHER THEY ARE FBI INFORMANTS WITH THE UNITED STATES OR ASSETS DEVELOPED ABROAD TO FIND CRUCIAL INFORMATION ABOUT INTENTIONS AND CAPABILITIES, WE ARE SIMPLY NOT GOING TO HAVE THOSE SOURCES. IF WE CANNOT PROTECT THE METHODS -- WHETHER WE ARE TALKING ABOUT ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE OR SIGNALS INTERCEPTIONS FROM SATELLITES IN THE SKY -- WE ARE GOING TO LOSE THE METHODS THAT ARE SO IMPORTANT TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY.

THIS IS NOT TO SAY THAT WE SHOULD BE UNBRIDLED AND NOT SUBJECT TO SCRUTINY SIMPLY BECAUSE WE HAVE INVOKED THE NEED FOR SECRECY. THERE ARE OFFICIAL SURROGATES WATCHING OUT FOR THE PUBLIC INTEREST. THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT,

THE HUGHES-RYAN AMENDMENT, AND THE INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT ACT ARE ALL DESIGNED TO PROVIDE THE RULE THAT WILL ENABLE THE CONGRESS TO EXAMINE THE EFFECTIVENESS AND THE APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS TAKEN IN THE NAME OF SECRECY. THE STATUTES REQUIRE THAT IT IS OUR DUTY TO NOTIFY THE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES OF ANY SIGNIFICANT INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES -- THAT INCLUDES THE REQUIREMENT OF A PRESIDENTIAL FINDING WHENEVER ACTIVITY OTHER THAN INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION IS INVOLVED. THE PRESIDENT CAN LIMIT THE NOTIFICATION TO THE CONGRESS TO A GROUP THAT WE CALL THE "GANG OF EIGHT" -- THE CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES, THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE.

BUT WE MUST REPORT IN A TIMELY FASHION. YOU HAVE HEARD A GOOD DEAL OF DEBATE, I THINK, AND CERTAINLY I GOT A GOOD DEAL OF QUESTIONING DURING THE CONFIRMATION PROCEEDINGS ABOUT WHAT WAS OR WAS NOT TIMELY. BILLS HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED IN THE CURRENT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO DETERMINE WHAT IS OR IS NOT TIMELY. I THINK WE ARE GOING TO FIND SOME SOLUTION TO THAT. THE PRACTICE HAS

BEEN TO TRY TO NOTIFY THE CONGRESS WITHIN 48 HOURS OF THE ADOPTION OF A PRESIDENTIAL FINDING. BUT MORE THAN THIS TIMELINESS AND MORE THAN THIS DISCLOSURE, IT SEEMS TO ME IMPORTANT IN DEALING WITH COVERT ACTION THAT WE HAVE WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH THE ABILITY TO MANAGE IT OURSELVES. ANY COVERT ACTION WE UNDERTAKE MUST BE DOABLE OR WE SHOULDN'T UNDERTAKE IT. AND IT MUST BE DOABLE IN A LAWFUL WAY. WE ALSO HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO THE INDIVIDUALS ON THE FIRING LINE -- THE PEOPLE ABROAD WHO WE GO OUT AND ASK TO DEVELOP THIS INFORMATION OR TO IMPLEMENT A SPECIFIC FOREIGN POLICY. THEY MUST HAVE THE KIND OF FLEXIBILITY THAT THEY NEED -- AWAY FROM THIS COUNTRY UNPROTECTED BY OUR CONSTITUTION -- TO DO THE JOB.

AT THE SAME TIME, IT'S NECESSARY THAT THEY KNOW THE RULES WITH WHICH THEY'RE OPERATING AND THAT THEY BE ADEQUATELY TRAINED TO CARRY OUT THOSE RULES KNOWING THAT IN THE END THOSE RULES PROTECT THEM AS WELL AS US. AND SO WE HAVE WITHIN THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY A COVERT ACTION REVIEW GROUP WHICH MUST FIRST LOOK AT THE PROPOSALS AS THEY COME IN AND ARE DEVELOPED AND ASK

THESE KINDS OF QUESTIONS. OF COURSE FIRST IS IT DOABLE? BUT THEN IS IT CONSISTENT WITH OUR OVERT FOREIGN POLICY AS WE UNDERSTAND IT? THE CLEAREST EXAMPLE OF DEPARTURE FROM THAT PRINCIPLE WAS THE SUPPLYING OF ARMS TO IRAN WHEN OUR FOREIGN POLICY WAS NOT TO SUPPLY ARMS TO COUNTRIES SPONSORING TERRORISM. IS IT OF SUCH A NATURE THAT IF IT BECOMES PUBLIC -- AS SO MANY DO -- IT WILL MAKE SENSE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE? THAT HAS TO DO WITH OUR CREDIBILITY AND THE TRUST THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE IN US. AND FINALLY A BROAD QUESTION, BUT ONE THAT I THINK IS WORTH ASKING: IS IT CONSISTENT WITH AMERICAN VALUES? WE TRY TO APPLY THE SAME KIND OF SCRUTINY AS THE PROPOSAL LEAVES THE AGENCY AND GOES FORWARD TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY PLANNING GROUP AT WHICH THE PRESIDENT IS NORMALLY PRESENT AND HEARS THE ARGUMENTS ALONG WITH THE CHIEF POLICYMAKERS OF HIS ADMINISTRATION -- SECRETARIES OF STATE, DEFENSE, TREASURY, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. THE PRESIDENT SIGNS OFF ON IT, THEN IT GOES ON AS I SAID BEFORE TO THE CONGRESS.

IN OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH CONGRESS, I BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT FOR US TO RECOGNIZE THAT IT MUST BE ONE OF TRUTH AND NOT OF DECEPTION. THERE IS SO MUCH

CONFUSION ABOUT DENIABILITY AND DECEPTION COMING OVER THE TELEVISION TUBES THAT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO MAKE ONE LEGITIMATE DISTINCTION. IN COVERT ACTIVITY THERE IS OFTEN DECEPTION TO CONCEAL THE SOURCE OF THE ACTIVITY IN ORDER TO INFLUENCE THROUGH MEANS THAT WE BELIEVE TO BE APPROPRIATE BUT WHICH MUST NECESSARILY BE COVERT. BUT IN DEALING WITH THE CONGRESS THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO EXCUSE FOR DECEPTION. THERE MAY BE OCCASIONS -- AND I TOLD THE CONGRESS THIS IN MY TESTIMONY -- WHEN I DID NOT BELIEVE THAT I WAS IN A POSITION TO RESPOND TO A PARTICULAR QUESTION, PARTICULARLY IF IT WERE IN OPEN SESSION. BUT I BELIEVE IT IS POSSIBLE TO TELL THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS -- AND I HAVE DONE SO ON OCCASION -- THAT I AM NOT AT LIBERTY TO ANSWER THE QUESTION, THAT I HAVE AN ANSWER BUT I CANNOT GIVE IT. THAT, IN MY VIEW, IS A LOT DIFFERENT THAN TRYING TO ANSWER THE QUESTION NARROWLY WHEN I KNOW WHAT THE CONGRESS WANTS TO HEAR FROM ME, AND PRETENDING THAT THEY HAVE FAILED TO ASK THE QUESTION ACCURATELY ENOUGH, GIVING THEM AN ANSWER ONLY TO THE NARROW QUESTION THAT THEY HAVE ASKED. I THINK WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO SPEAK TO EACH

OTHER AS INDIVIDUALS DOING BUSINESS WITH EACH OTHER, KNOWING WHAT EACH OTHER WANTS TO KNOW AND BEING HONEST ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE GOING TO TELL THEM OR NOT TELL THEM. IF I DECLINE TO TELL, FOR REASONS THAT SEEM LEGITIMATE TO ME, OR UNDER THE PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE QUESTION IS ASKED, THERE ARE ALWAYS OPPORTUNITIES TO ELEVATE THAT ISSUE -- FOR CONGRESS TO APPEAL OVER MY HEAD -- OR THEY MIGHT MAKE IT ROUGH ENOUGH ON ME THAT I MAY CONCLUDE THAT I SHOULD. BUT AT LEAST A LEVEL OF HONESTY THAT NOTHING IS BEING WITHHELD BY DECEPTION IS VITALLY IMPORTANT IN THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE BALANCE AND SHARING OF POWERS.

WE RELY ON COOPERATION WITH THE CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. WE ALSO RELY ON COOPERATION OUTSIDE THE GOVERNMENT WITH OUR FRIENDS IN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY. THAT IS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY I WAS GLAD TO ACCEPT THIS INVITATION. ACADEMICS WERE PART OF THE OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES AND HELPED CREATE THE CIA IN 1947, AND WE'VE BEEN RELYING ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND INSTITUTIONS SUCH AS BROOKINGS FOR THE EXPERTISE THAT THEY

CAN PROVIDE IN DEVELOPING ACCURATE ASSESSMENTS ON A WHOLE RANGE OF ISSUES THAT HELP OUR POLICYMAKERS MAKE WISE AND SOUND JUDGMENTS. THERE ARE AT LEAST 43 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WHERE A COURSE IN INTELLIGENCE IS BEING TAUGHT THIS YEAR. IN MANY OTHERS, INTELLIGENCE IS BEING DISCUSSED IN TERMS OF HOW IT RELATES TO FOREIGN POLICYMAKING. IN MOST OF THESE SITUATIONS IT IS WORKING VERY WELL. THERE IS NOTHING THAT WE DO IN THIS AREA THAT IS SECRET. IT IS OPEN, CAN BE DISPUTED, AND IN MOST CASES IT IS WARMLY WELCOME, AND I HOPE THAT IT WILL CONTINUE IN THAT WAY. AGENCY OFFICERS PARTICIPATE IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARLY ORGANIZATIONS AND THEY MAKE SUCH PRESENTATIONS ALL OVER THE COUNTRY.

TO SUM UP, I WOULD SAY THAT THERE IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY FOR INTELLIGENCE. THIS RESPONSIBILITY IS SHARED BY THE CONGRESS, AND BY THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY OVER WHICH I PRESIDE. WE IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WANT TO WORK CLOSELY WITH THOSE WHO MAKE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS BY PROVIDING ASSESSMENTS OBJECTIVELY AND PROFESSIONALLY. WE HAVE WORKED WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES WHICH ACT AS SURROGATES TO THE CONGRESS AND THE

AMERICAN PEOPLE AND WE MUST BE WORTHY OF THEIR TRUST. WE MUST DILIGENTLY
CARRY OUT OUR ASSIGNMENTS AROUND THE WORLD, HOWEVER DIFFICULT, WITH FIDELITY
TO OUR CONSTITUTION AND TO THE LAWS OF OUR BELOVED COUNTRY. IT SEEMS TO ME
THAT A NATION DEDICATED TO THE RULE OF LAW CAN PROTECT ITSELF AND ITS HERITAGE
IN NO OTHER WAY.